1 2

VS.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3:09-cv-00145-LRH-VPC

ALVIN RANKIN, JR.,

Petitioner,

ORDER

HOWARD SKOLNIK, et al.,

Respondents.

This habeas matter under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 comes before the Court following initial review under Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases (the "Habeas Rules") of the amended petition (#27) filed by the Federal Public Defender. Following upon said review, a response will be directed.

IT THEREFORE IS ORDERED that respondents shall have forty-five (45) days from entry of this order within which to answer, or otherwise respond to, the amended petition, including by motion to dismiss. Any response filed shall comply with the remaining provisions below, which are tailored to this particular case based upon the Court's screening of the amended petition and which are entered pursuant to Habeas Rule 4.

IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that any procedural defenses raised by respondents in this case shall be raised together in a single motion to dismiss. Procedural defenses omitted from such motion to dismiss will be subject to potential waiver. Respondents shall not file a response in this case that consolidates their procedural defenses, if any, with their response on the merits, except pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(2) as to any unexhausted claims clearly lacking merit.

IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that, in any answer filed on the merits, respondents shall specifically cite to and address the applicable state court written decision and state court record materials, if any, regarding each claim within the response as to that claim

IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that any additional exhibits filed by the parties herein shall be filed with a separate index of exhibits identifying the exhibits by number or letter. The CM/ECF attachments that are filed further shall be identified by the number or numbers (or letter or letters) of the exhibits in the attachment, as counsel for petitioner has done in ## 28-30.

IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that petitioner shall have thirty (30) days from service of the answer, motion to dismiss, or other response to file a reply or opposition.

The Court will be seeking to resolve all aspects of this case no later than April 30, 2012. Accordingly, in the event of any scheduling conflicts between this case and other matters in this District, counsel, in the absence of extraordinary circumstances, should seek any necessary extension of time in the later-filed case.

DATED this 12th day of May, 2011.

LARRY R. HICKS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Elsihe